

Remarks

This Reply to Final Office Action is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 16, 2009. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2009, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Lipkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,747).

II. Discussion of the Claims

Claim 24

Claim 24, as currently presented, defines generating a unified user profile by creating an extended user class to extend the base user class such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be, by using methods inherited by the extended user class from the base user class, transparently retrieved from and updated in, using the extended user class, *both the personalization database and an external user database* independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database.

In the Office Action, it was apparently submitted that, because Lipkin discloses the transfer of a single object to two database tables, Lipkin thus discloses retrieving from and updating in both the personalization database and an external user database.

Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. It is well known in the computer database-related arts that a database may contain more than one table. For example, a relational database, such as a SQL database can use multiple tables within a single database in order to organize its data. Similarly, Lipkin discloses a metadata store with multiple tables (col. 13, line 5 to col. 17, line 7). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the storing of an object into two tables does not necessarily disclose the use of more than one database. In contrast, Claim 24 requires retrieving from and updating both a personalization database and an external user database.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Lipkin does not disclose generating a unified user profile by creating an extended user class to extend the base user class such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be, by using methods inherited by the extended user class from the base user class, transparently retrieved from and updated in, using the extended user class, both the personalization database and an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database, as required by Claim 24.

Claim 24 also defines generating a unified user profile by creating an extended user class to extend the base user class such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be, by using methods inherited by the extended user class from the base user class, transparently retrieved from and updated in, using the extended user class, both the personalization database and an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database.

In the Office Action, it was asserted that Lipkin, in disclosing the creating of a security list (col. 42, lines 43-48) and a SabaSecurityManager class that extends the ISabaRemote class (col. 42, lines 15-48), discloses the above features.

However, as described above, the methods defined in the ISabaRemote class operate on multiple tables within a single database, but do not appear to operate on multiple databases. While the SabaSecurityManager class appears to extend the ISabaRemote class with methods to create and manage security lists col. 42, lines 15-48), those methods still act on the same database as the ISabaRemote class, without extending the ISabaRemote class to operate on an external user database separate from the database operated on by methods in the ISabaRemote class.

Furthermore, as further described above, because Lipkin's disclosure of the transfer of an object to two tables does not specifically teach using or accessing more than one database, applicant respectfully submits that Lipkin similarly does not disclose that the unified user profile allows the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of whether the accessed data is in the personalization database or the external user database, as required by Claim 24.

In the Office Action, it was also asserted that "[t]he security list allows the users to ... set or get employee values in table name tpt_person and database table name tpt_person_2 using business object" and that "by using business object, the users do not know the employee values are in table name tpt_person and database table name tpt_person_2." Applicants respectfully traverses this assertion, for the following reasons.

Lipkin appears to disclose that a security list is a mechanism by which members are matched with privileges in a system, such as the ability to create, delete, edit, or view business objects (col. 39, lines 25-26 and tables 1-4). By assigning business objects to a specific domain, security privileges can be applied to specific business objects by assigning those security privileges to domains assigned to those specific business objects.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Lipkin does not appear to disclose how a security list might allow a single business object to set or get employee values in multiple databases tables. Lipkin similarly does not appear to disclose any example of a user setting or getting employee values in tables

tpt_person and tpt_person_2 using a business object. Instead, Lipkin only appears to disclose examples of security lists and how it sets limits on the access of users to business objects.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Lipkin does not disclose generating a unified user profile by creating an extended user class to extend the base user class such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be, by using methods inherited by the extended user class from the base user class, transparently retrieved from and updated in, using the extended user class, both the personalization database and an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database, as required by Claim 24.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 24 is not anticipated by the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 63 and 68

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 68 are likewise not anticipated by Lipkin, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the features that they require. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are similarly not anticipated by Lipkin, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Mar. 13, 2009

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800